III.   REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 10, 15 and 18-22 have been amended. Claims 18-22 are rejected under 35 USC §101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Gupta et al. (US 6226752) (hereinafter referred to as "Gupta"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections for the reasons provided below.

Applicant does not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserves the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicant reserves the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application.

A. REJECTIONS BASED ON 35 USC §101

In the Office Action, claims 18-22 are rejected under 35 USC §101 alleging Applicant's invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Office Action p.5-6

Without conceding the correctness of the Office's interpretation, and to facilitate early allowance of the pending claims, claims 18-22 have been amended to recite "computer recordable medium" as recited in the specification. Accordingly, Applicant asserts that the bases for the Office's rejection have been obviated and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

B. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-22 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

With regard to the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection over Gupta, Applicant asserts that Gupta does not teach each and every feature of the claimed invention.

Specifically regarding the Office's rejections of claims 1 (and similarly claims 10, 15 and 18): Applicant submits that Gupta fails to teach each and every feature of claim 1 (and similarly claims 10, 15 and 18), as amended.

Claim 1, as amended, recites, *inter alia*, "wherein when the session is invalid and a new session between applicant and client is established the application data is submitted to the network application without reentry of the application data by a user once the new session is ensured as valid." Gupta does not teach these features.

Applicant respectfully submits the amendments place the claims in condition for allowance. Applicant's amendments make clear the "reentry" is of "application data" that is referenced in the claim as "an original submission of the application data." In other words, the original submission of application data is not lost once the new session is established and ensured as valid thereby negating the need for a subsequent submission of application data. Claim 1 (as amended). The "cookies" reference in Gupta does not teach this feature. C.5 l.42 – C.6 l.45.

Applicant's amendments provide clarity and further support for Applicant's previous arguments. Applicant previously argued a cookie, such as the one in Gupta, must have stored information, i.e., information that has already been entered, in order to function correctly. To this extent, the information in the cookie of Gupta cannot be an original submission. In contrast, the claimed inventions include "receiving an original submission of the application data using the data page…wherein when the session is invalid and a new session between applicant and client is established the application

data is submitted to the network application without reentry of the application data by a user once the new session is ensured as valid." Claim 1 (as amended). Unlike Gupta, the application data of the claimed invention submitted to the network application is an original submission without reentry of the application data by the user regardless of session inactivity. Thus, Gupta does not teach the submission of data to the network application of the claimed invention.

For all the above reasons, it is clear that Gupta does not teach each and every feature of Applicant's invention. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 1 (and similarly claims 10, 15 and 18) is not anticipated by Gupta.

With respect to the dependent claims, Applicant herein incorporates the arguments presented above with respect to the independent claims from which the claims depend. Furthermore, Applicant submits that all dependant claims are allowable based on their own distinct features. Since the cited art does not teach each and every feature of the claimed invention, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

IV. CONCLUSION

In addition to the above arguments, Applicant submits that each of the pending claims is patentable for one or more additional unique features. To this extent, Applicant does not acquiesce to the Office's interpretation of the claimed subject matter or the references used in rejecting the claimed subject matter. Additionally, Applicant does not acquiesce to the Office's combinations and modifications of the various references or the motives cited for such combinations and modifications. These features and the appropriateness of the Office's combinations and modifications have not been separately addressed herein for brevity. However, Applicant reserves the right to present such arguments in a later response should one be necessary.

In light of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that all claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner require anything further to place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/David E. Rook/

Date: July 31, 2008

David E. Rook
Reg. No.: 40,790

Hoffman Warnick LLC
75 State Street, 14th Floor
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 449-0044
(518) 449-0047 (fax)